DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 476 SP 038 048

AUTHOR Frana, Bruce S.
TITLE High School Culture and (Mis)Perceptions of Support: A Case Study of Success and Failure for Interdisciplinary Team Teaching.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Educational Innovation; *High Schools; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Longitudinal Studies; *Misconceptions; Principals; *School Culture; *Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods; *Team Teaching

ABSTRACT

This study examined three teams of teachers at three high schools (in a relatively large midwestern school district) as they designed and implemented a teaming project for interdisciplinary teaching entitled the Partners Program. The study focused on two findings related to the demise of this innovation: misconceptions by participating teachers regarding the support they believed existed for their pilot project and the strong influence school and department cultures had on change within the high school setting. The study collected data during 1991-1992 and 1992-1993 and follow-up data during 1997-1998. Interviews involved nine participating team teachers, three high school principals, and three district central administrators. There were also informal interviews with department chairs, other building teachers, counselors, assistant principals, and district curriculum facilitators. The researcher observed individual team planning meetings and combined team meetings. Results indicated that lack of support for the innovation by the culture and sub-cultures of the department/subject areas had a strong influence on the demise of the program. Despite loss of funding, the Partners Program has continued to exist at one of the high schools. (Contains 121 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 421 476

High School Culture and (Mis)Perceptions of Support: A Case Study of Success and Failure for Interdisciplinary Team Teaching

Bruce S. Frana

Cornell College

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeintg of the American Educational Research Association

San Diego, April, 1998

SP038048

B. Frana

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

High School Culture and (Mis)Perceptions of Support:
A Case Study of Success and Failure for Interdisciplinary Team Teaching

Several of the latest reform movements have included the call for interdisciplinary team teaching at the secondary school level. This is an approach to curriculum that consciously applies the methodology, language, and content from more than one discipline. In the area of science education, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (1989) has recommended the use of an interdisciplinary approach to instruction. National reform movements, such as the Coalition of Essential Schools (Sizer, 1984) and Outcomes Based Education (Spady & Marshall, 1991), are on record for their support of interdisciplinary education. The executive director of the Alliance for Curriculum Reform includes interdisciplinary curriculum as one of the seven critical restructuring elements (Cawelti, 1995). Early in this decade an alliance of 33 subject-matter groups and the Education Commission of the States formed to push integrated or interdisciplinary learning to the front of the reform agenda (Viadero. 1991). Teachers have called for interdisciplinary teaching (Murphy, Evertson & Radnofsky, 1990); most recent calls come from teachers themselves who are attempting interdisciplinary teaching and team teaching at the high school level (Spies, 1994, 1996). Clearly, interdisciplinary teaching is being supported and endorsed by a wide constituency in education.

Such a call for change places an emphasis on the people most involved in the implementation of change in schools. "Educational change depends on what teachers do and think - it's as simple and complex as that" (p. 107)--Michael Fullan wrote these words in 1982 describing his perspective of educational change. With a similar perspective, Cambone, Weiss and Wyeth (1992) quote a teacher: "Administrators are powerless because they can't do anything teachers don't want to do" (p. 33). My purpose as I set out to conduct this study was to follow the lead of these authors and examine what teachers do and think when they are engaged in the process of introducing or implementing an educational reform. I, too, believed that the success or failure of educational reform depended largely on the actual teachers involved in implementing that reform. Thus I

undertook a study of three teams of teachers as they set out to design and implement a teaming project which they would come to call the "Partners Program" (PP).

One intent of this paper is to focus on two findings that relate to the demise of this innovation: misperceptions by the participating teachers with regard to the support they believed existed for their pilot project; and the strong influence school and department cultures have on change within the high school setting. A second intent is to analyze how one team, in spite of these findings and the loss of district support, has continued to flourish.

Support, whether by a principal or another significant individual, is important in the success of any attempted change (Blase & Kirby, 1992; Crandall & Loucks, 1983; Gross, Giacquinta, & Bernstein, 1971; Hall & Hord, 1987; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Louis, Kruse, & Raywid, 1996; Louis & Murphy, 1994; Newmann, Rutter, & Smith, 1989; Raywid, 1997; Rosenholtz, 1989; Stapleford, 1994). This case study clearly presents a dichotomy--the perception of support by the administrators and a perception of little or no support by the teachers. This paper discusses how this misperception may have occurred and how it affected the teachers involved in the PP innovation.

The culture of a system prevents the invasion of innovation (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Dunne, 1994; Marshall, 1991; Sarason, 1971, 1982). In this case, the teachers were part of a high school group and the idea of moving a "middle school" concept to the high school was antithetical to the sub-culture of departments and separate subject areas (A. Hargreaves, 1992a, 1994). It is the "culture" of high schools which can make change difficult because of the marginalization of any members who attempt to defect to another system and the departments themselves create a culture of separation (Johnson, 1990; Prestine, 1994; Riseborough, 1981; Siskin, 1990, 1991, 1994). It was these "sub-cultures" that had one of the greatest impacts on the teachers themselves.

Three high schools--East, West and North, all within the North Bend Community School District[1] --began the pilot program with varying levels of implicit and explicit support. Only West High continued the PP after funding had ended. These three teachers had expressed concerns about their peers, their administrative support, and how the loss of funding would affect their

continuation. And yet, they have continued to exist within their relatively large high school for five years after the demise of the program. This addendum to the story has implications as to how change and innovation can continue in spite of overwhelming problems.

I believe the results are important to the understanding of the change process. As Blase (1991) has stated, administrators or change agents often use perspectives and agendas that are "technical rather than political, practical rather than ethical, and as individual rather than collective" (p. 24). I have discovered the usual problems encountered in innovation as reported in literature: jealousies, poor training, lack of commitment, accommodation, adaptation, budget constraints, and such. In part, all are within the story for reasons why the team teaching program would not receive continued funding. And yet, in spite of all these "barriers", teachers and one administrator have remained committed and continue to believe in the innovation as viable and important in the high school setting. It is partially for these reasons that I have conducted further interviews with those people who continue the innovation in spite of the loss of district support. How is it that the overall team teaching innovation failed and, yet, one school and team has continued the practice?

Methods

I collected the data over nearly two years, the 1991-'92 and 1992-'93 academic years, and follow-up data in the 1997-'98 academic year, in a relatively large midwestern school district. The larger case study involved following the implementation of the team teaching innovation within the district's three high schools. I formally interviewed the nine participating team teachers, three high school principals and three district central administrators--these interviews were about an hour each at a minimum of three times during the course of this study. Informal interviews consisted of department chairs, other building teachers, counselors, assistant principals, and district curriculum facilitators--these interviews were usually a half-hour in length. I also observed the individual team planning meetings within the schools (at least three times) and combined team meetings at the district level (eight times).

I selected a micropolitical view in studying the implementation of innovation in order to gain more insight into the process of innovation. Micropolitics

> refers to the use of formal and informal power by individuals and groups to achieve their goals in organizations. In large part, political actions result from perceived differences between individuals and groups, coupled with the motivation to use power to influence and/or protect. Although such actions are consciously motivated, any action, consciously or unconsciously motivated, may have political "significance" in a given situation. Both cooperative and conflictive actions and processes are part of the realm of micropolitics. Moreover, macro- and micropolitical factors frequently interact. (Blase, 1991, p. 11)

In other words, my intentions were to view the innovation process as the teachers themselves viewed and experienced it. I wanted to know more about the political actions and motivations of teachers, those involved as well as those who were not, so that I could better understand the entire process and experience of developing and introducing teamed interdisciplinary teaching into a content driven high school setting.

Given the nature of the study--i.e., an examination of school innovation from a micropolitical perspective--a qualitative approach was employed. My desire, as Common (1983) has stated, was to "go beyond the surface appearance of events in order to understand" (p. 208). A qualitative approach, in that it focuses on understanding, must go beyond the surface level by focusing on the complex interactions among the teachers and administrators and on what these interactions mean to those involved in the change process.

I used a triangulation method for data collection which included interviews, observation, and historical/archival documents (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). The historical and archival materials consisted of meeting announcements, proposals, teacher diaries/journals, survey results (parent and student), district and building research and demographic data, North Central Association (NCA) Reports, and building handbooks, as well as parent/community newsletters. I observed the teachers in their team planning times, large group meetings (i.e., meetings of all three teams), and during their attendance at local conferences. Finally, interviews were undertaken with all the major participants in the reform.

The Community and District

North Bend is a large (150,000) Midwestern city that has been tightly connected to the industrial sector of the state for the past century. The community is predominantly middle class, with a growing white collar population as well as areas or pockets of low income scattered

throughout the community; the low income areas tend to be in the old sections of the inner city or in expanding border areas of the inner city as urban renewal has taken place. The city itself has a small non-white population of 4.5%.

Today the district serves over 15,000 students, pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade, in 22 elementary buildings, six middle schools, three comprehensive high schools, and one special high school. The district encompasses most of the city proper, one small adjoining community, two small neighboring communities, and some rural areas. The large majority of the students reside within the expanding city limits.

The key elements in the District's Strategic Plan for School Improvement, which was developed by the Superintendent and the Executive Committee, include the following:

1. An Instructional Program that ensures the integration and application of the following skills by every instructor for every student: . . . Teaming and Collaboration.
2. An integrated curriculum that focuses on future oriented learning . . . .
3. A school improvement focus that . . . promotes comprehensive staff development.
4. A supportive Environment that . . . promotes a positive, collaborative climate for all employees.
5. School Community Relationships that . . . improve school-home interactions and support.

The elements that were included in the PP matched those of the District Strategic Plan. The PP idea, by having teachers of different disciplines work together, was to increase staff collaboration and reduce a sense of isolation. Moreover, it was thought by administrators that the PP would lead to increased contacts with, and involvement among, teachers and parents/guardians. Ultimately, of course, the intent was that students would have a more successful transition from middle school to high school. And, some leaders within the district saw this innovation as a catalyst to foster continued change in the high schools.

THE INNOVATION

The Partners Program innovation grew out of a previous innovation undertaken in the mid-1980s, i.e., restructuring middle schools. The 9th grade had been moved into the high schools in the fall of 1986 as the result of a district-wide change to the middle school concept, incorporating 6th through 8th grade in the former junior high buildings. A team teaching approach was implemented in the middle schools. The initial innovation led directly to the need for the current

innovation. Changing to the middle school concept had the unintended consequence of increasing 9th grade failure and drop-out rates.

The former Assistant Superintendent for Middle Schools and the East High School principal decided to develop some type of pilot project to test the idea to assist 9th grade students in the transition from middle school to high school (Derrickson, 1995). The team-teaching approach itself was designed and decided upon by three teachers representing three core subject areas in each of the participating high schools. These teachers were selected by their respective principals. Using money secured from an outside source, the three teachers were released to meet together each afternoon for six months to read and discuss possible approaches. The final decision was to have a three-person team at each of three high schools. The idea was that the average student was left out of any special programming (Spies, 1994). By sharing the same students for three periods a day, and thereby having extra time to concentrate on student problems at a more personal level, the teachers hoped to assist in the transition to ninth grade. The additional teacher time came in the form of an extra preparation period. This time was for the discussion of student problems, contact with parents/guardians/significant people and other support personnel in the building, and to share ideas for implementing some interdisciplinary teaching (Kruse & Louis, 1995; Spies, 1994, 1995, 1996).[2]

The individual teams were allowed the freedom to be flexible in designing the program. One school (West High) selected a heterogeneous group of students with the intent of teaching all three sections in this fashion. Cooperative learning and citizenship/volunteerism were to be two thrusts of the team. A second group (East High) selected the average students and concentrated on basic skills. Their thrust, after realizing that they wanted to concentrate on only one or two major ideas, became the students and their personal problems.

The PP at North High was restricted at first as to which teachers could be involved--no one teaching AP classes or serving the at-risk programs would be favorably considered by the principal because he believed this could cause problems for these other special programs. The PP had started with the hope of interdisciplinary teaching to a cross-section of students. Again they were limited

by the principal, as one participating teacher noted: "Dr. Brown (principal) made it very clear at the start that this would probably be for average level kids. Because we had programs for top level and we had programs for skills, this would probably be for average level kids." The principal put it as follows in respect to top level students: "Part of that is just survival on my part; I mean I'm not interested in [having] a bunch of parents who believe that they have top level kids call me and tell me that their kids are in a mediocre level program." From the initial development, then, this team and program had restrictions and controls placed upon it by the principal in the "interest" of some parents.

Based on my interviews with the nine teachers, the first year was very stressful for all the teams because of the nature of the students, student problems, and the intensity of the three-member teams working together to design a program "on the run". At the end of the first year, however, all three teams believed they had been successful with students and had received positive feedback from parents concerning the extra contact with them, as well as the extra attention the students had received. Although some students were referred to the alternative high school, principals and teachers both believed that more students were retained and were more successful than in previous years. The downside of the first year was the loss of two team members. At North H.S. the math team member decided near the end of the year to leave the pilot program; his hope and goals for interdisciplinary teaching had not been realized and he said this lack of progress was causing him personal stress. The team leader from East High left her respective team in August for a math curriculum position in central administration.

The second year for all three teams was also a successful venture from their point of view. Better students with fewer personal problems and a year of previous experience boosted teachers' morale. By mid-year, however, all three teams questioned whether the program would continue if money became a big issue. All members had known that project funding for the nine teachers was for a two year period, but they also expected that their success with students would ensure their survival beyond the initial funding. They realized that the District and State were under budget constraints, but they also believed, along with some District administrators, that if this program

worked, funding would be found. They were wrong. Without being consulted, team members were informed the program would continue only through their own efforts and without any funding from within the District or from outside sources. What they were not totally aware of, although at least one teacher suspected, was how this decision came about. Behind-the-scenes discussions and politics were taking place between and among district administrators.

The PP, although begun with much enthusiasm on the part of the teachers, certain central administrators, and at least two of the three high school principals, lasted only two years. In the face of the ostensible support for this innovation, the question, of course, is what happened? This paper discusses the two findings most closely and personally related to the teachers for the demise of this program.[3]

First, the teachers, either correctly or incorrectly, believed that the support they were receiving from administrators, especially the building principals, began to diminish shortly after the innovation began. This led to a climate of uncertainty and, possibly, misperceptions may have diminished the chances for success. Second, the nature of this innovation, with its interdisciplinary team approach and its student centered emphasis, ran counter to the "culture" of the high school which focuses on the transmission of subject matter.

This Case Study and Literature

The following is not intended to be a comprehensive review of the literature. Rather, the story continues with the discussion and elaboration of the intricate relationships among the many facets within the story of educational change and district innovation. This case study has revealed the many issues that arise with intended change and restructuring and how these issues are interrelated. All of these contribute to the difficulties inherent in the change process and are more visible when viewed through a micropolitical lens--the implicit becomes more explicit, the covert more visibly overt.

Support

Emotional Support

Support, whether by a principal or another significant individual, is important in the success of any attempted change (Blase & Kirby, 1992; Crandall & Loucks, 1983; Gross et al., 1971; Hall & Hord, 1987; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Louis & Murphy, 1994; Newmann et al., 1989; Rosenholtz, 1989; Stapleford, 1994). This case study clearly presents a dichotomy--the perception of support by the administrators and a perception of little or no support by the teachers. The following discusses how this misperception may have occurred and how it affected the teachers involved in the PP innovation.

Because the teachers all found themselves in new and unexpected roles, they were also uncertain as to how they were progressing professionally and whether they were meeting the District's expectations for teachers. They anticipated some type of feedback from their administrators (Louis, 1995)--"When you're looking at school transformation, I think it's real important to know that my administrators are reading professionally and could give me materials that could help me . . . because that's part of helping people know that they're on the right track" (LA team member at East). As David Hargreaves (1980) states:

> Because the teacher's role is diffuse, being both multifaceted and very unspecific in some of its goals, there are acute difficulties in obtaining the feedback by which a teacher can judge his effectiveness. Direct forms of unambiguous feedback are scarce so a teacher, much more than a doctor or lawyer, sees his work as requiring an act of faith. (p. 136)

Unfortunate as this may seem, teachers then look to others for some form of acknowledgment of their work. The principals had been the ones closest to the teachers, had selected the teachers for participation, and had encouraged the PP pilot program within the schools. This was a reasonable expectation for teachers who were putting themselves in such a situation (Panaritis, 1995; Spies, 1996).

Reinforcement of the vision by the leadership desiring change is very important for the success of change (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1994; Vandenberghe & Staessens, 1991). Teachers must understand and be supported through the understanding and implementation of the vision (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Fernandez, 1994; Louis, 1992). As stated

earlier, teachers rely on feedback from others, including their administrators, for affirmation of what they are accomplishing within their classrooms.

In this case study, each principal had a different perspective on his role in the building and his role with the innovation. The two principals at East High and West High were strong supporters of the innovation and were excited about the opportunity to introduce this type of change into the high schools. Their personal educational philosophies paralleled the philosophy behind the Partners Program. They endorsed the concept and worked with the teachers, parents, and students in regards to the program. The principal at North High was ambivalent to the concept and had his own reasons for accepting the innovation and selecting the teachers to be involved. He had few overt reactions to, or involvement with, the implementation--he had few interactions with students, teachers, or parents about the concept. If it was to survive, it would do so on its own. The following sections discuss explicit and implicit actions and reactions by the principals to the team teaching concept in the high schools and the reflections of literature to this aspect of change.

By their reactions as the year went on, this became evident: administrators believed they were giving a lot of visible and verbal support to the teachers (which was contrary to the teachers' perceptions). Two of the principals had "visions" of teaming becoming the norm within their schools. In order to do so, both realized the importance of recognizing the teachers involved in the PP and extoling the attributes of this innovation as they applied to their own visions for the high school (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Louis et al., 1994; Raywid, 1997; Vandenberghe & Staessens, 1991). This they realized would be important to slowly change the existing culture within each building (Leithwood et al., 1994; Louis, 1994; Pink, 1994; Vandenberghe & Staessens, 1991). Unfortunately, the participating teachers refused to allow the principals to explicitly and overtly bring attention to the innovation. Nevertheless, the principal at East included teaming in his vision of the school and discussed the concept during his building staff meetings. He believed that he provided support to the PP teachers without calling attention to the program itself, just as the teachers had requested. The principal at West also believed he was supporting the teachers as they had requested.

An unfortunate situation, however, developed in this case study. Two of the principals wanted to openly support the PP but the teachers wanted it "quiet." The participating teachers refused to allow the principals to explicitly and overtly bring attention to the innovation. The teachers feared additional negative comments/reactions from their colleagues. This, however, reflects what has been written by Waller (1932) and Lortie (1975) about teacher insecurities and uncertainties and how these could perhaps prevent teachers from wanting the recognition within the framework of their schools. This also relates to the egalitarian beliefs held by teachers. The other related problem was that the teams were expected to be something which they did not wish to be--leaders for change and were put up on a pedestal as such (Dunne, 1994; Muncey & McQuillan, 1996; Schwartz, 1971; Weiss, 1995).[4]

Teachers gain much from their feelings about their success with students and success in the classroom. Their sense of efficacy--the extent they believe they can affect student achievement (Dembo & Gibson, 1985) and the belief that one has the requisite skills to bring about the desired outcomes (Bandura, 1977)--is very closely related to this perception. Teachers, however, rarely receive any form of feedback from students, colleagues, or administrators. Because of this lack of feedback, teachers must rely on their own judgment concerning their teaching (D. Hargreaves, 1980; Lieberman & Miller, 1978). Problems for teachers arise from two situations relating to efficacy: student connected responses and adult related responses. The dichotomy is that the teachers in this study wanted privacy concerning the program and yet they were in search of praise from their principals. Teachers are accustomed to isolation and protect their privacy, but by doing so, also deprive themselves from any sources of praise and support (A. Hargreaves, 1992a).

Prestine (1994) provides further insight into the situation where teachers may find themselves when involved in innovative change:

> . . . the governance/organizational changes . . . affect school and administrative concerns that are somewhat removed from individual teacher's primary arena of activity, the classroom. Thus they can largely be accommodated without changes in individual practice or a challenge to personal beliefs and are basically seen as accruing to the overall benefit of teachers. [Curricular pedagogical] changes strike more directly at the individual teacher. Teacher identity is largely inseparable from the instructional act. Change in these areas involves personal change, including an implicit acknowledgment that what had been practiced was less adequate or

> desirable and a strenuous and time-consuming effort to discard old ways and learn new. (pp. 21-22)

The teachers were experiencing the dramatic changes in their classrooms--procedures, pedagogy, autonomy, student responses--and were wanting and expecting the acknowledgment for these efforts. The principals believed they were responding to these changes with some verbal and visual signs of support. However, it was not the principals' "identities" being challenged daily and therefore they could not empathize with the teachers' immediate needs for administrative acknowledgment. More specifically, the teachers were willing to take risks for change they believed needed to be done. Nevertheless, teachers involved in such restructuring must be supported for their risk-taking if change is to be sustained (Louis, 1992; Raywid, 1997).

Julie, the language arts team member at East High, talked about the loss of her individuality as a participant in this innovation. Some of her self-worth depended on the reactions from students and parents to her teaching (Cambone, Weiss & Wyeth, 1992). With the team approach, she was not receiving the responses from parents and students as she had previous to the PP. This is not unusual in light of research by McLaughlin (1993) and Raudenbush, Rowan, and Cheong (1990) who found that efficacy does change from class period to class period and is dependent on the relationship with students in the classes. In a sense, Julie had lost control of one feed-back mechanism she had relied on.

In spite of the administrators' sincere beliefs that they had done as the teams had requested, the teachers themselves felt maligned. This is an important finding for this aspect of the research literature. At what point is attention too much or not enough? The principals perceived that they responded to every request of the teachers and were providing the needed support for change (Crandall & Loucks, 1983; Gross et al., 1971; Hall & Hord, 1987; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Stapleford, 1994). But when asked how often they visited the teams, the response was similar: whenever the teams asked. The principals were busy with many other problems and concerns in their buildings. The principal at North explicitly noted that he had "other priorities and everyday problems to deal with." The teachers were hoping for continued visible support--emotional, verbal,

physical--but when this did not occur, they "felt abandoned and directionless" (Muncey & McQuillan, 1996, p. 246).

Blase and Kirby (1992), in their book, Bringing Out the Best in Teachers, make suggestions for principals based on their research in which they asked teachers what effective principals do "that leads to improved teacher motivation, commitment, and innovation" (p. xvi). Some of the suggestions from their book are:

(a) Praise sincerely--praise that is not contrived or awkward
(b) Schedule time for teacher recognition
(c) Write brief notes to compliment individuals
(d) Show pride in teachers by boasting
(e) Target praise to teachers' work
(f) Communicate consistently
(g) Seize and create opportunities
(h) Generalize expectations; personalize feedback
(i) Emphasize that autonomy is extended out of a sense of professionalism and confidence. It is not an abdication of authority--principals should offer advice when asked and intervene when individual problems are detected
(j) Use other influence strategies in conjunction with autonomy--such as conveying expectations, involving groups of teachers in schoolwide decisions, providing professional literature related to improvement, and providing opportunities for professional development
(k) Assist teachers in evaluating newly attempted techniques.

In the initial months of implementation, both principals and teachers described actions that would meet many of the criteria listed by Blase and Kirby. Midway through the first year, however, teachers were experiencing very few of these criteria listed. When asked about what they were doing in respect to the teachers, none of the principals suggested more than one or two of the criteria. The principal at East, because of his vision statements and change committee, was practicing several of the suggestions, but with all staff members rather than the team teachers individually. As much as the principals perceived themselves as showing support, their actions did not convey to the team members any of the criteria suggested by Blase and Kirby. The administrative support, which is so often expressed as important for change to occur, was not as visible and pronounced as the principals believed.

Principal support is an important ingredient in change. Another closely related concept, because this depends on the administrators and the power they have to provide this, is time (Adelman, Walking Eagle, & Hargreaves, 1997; Corwin, 1983; Dunne, 1994; Fullan, 1990; A. Hargreaves,

1994; Panaritis, 1995; Sarason, 1990). In this study, time was a problem in that longevity, or the time to develop and prove themselves, was promised and then reneged upon. Assistant Superintendent for High Schools had explicitly told the teachers that time would be needed, at least several years, before the results would be checked. The superintendent had made a similar statement and the principal at North, a known non-supporter, had also mentioned the same thing. The teachers took these statements as a symbol of patience and support for at least several years of funding. Time came to a halt when funding became an explicit issue within the district after less than two years of implementation.

A more immediate issue of time was the period provided for team meetings. Initially, all teams had an extra planning period for the teams to meet regarding student concerns, planning of subject connections, and curriculum design. When the teams were given the choice to continue on their own without the extra planning period, an initial promise had been made to provide a common planning time for the three members. This continued for the West team and allowed them to meet twice per week in order to continue team discussions. Eventually, even this time was taken away because of the "computer driven scheduling which didn't see a way to fit our planning time together" (West team member). The assistant principal in charge of scheduling could not or would not find a way to keep their "time" together as a priority (Siskin, 1995).

Another problem within the process was the lack of continued discussion and understanding for the reasons for the change. Prestine (1994) notes that it is imperative to maintain these connections between changes instituted and the reasons behind these changes. Since no one in the schools seemed to know the reasons for the teams, the teams were known by only a few and the concept was not accepted by many. No overt explanation was given to the members of the three staffs and there were no reports ever presented to them concerning the outcomes or progression of the teams. The Assistant Superintendent for Development maintained this was to be one of his goals but failed to follow-through on this with the principals. And, as reported by the principals themselves, very little time within their bi-weekly administrative meetings was devoted to

discussions about the teams so they, as well as the other administrators and teachers, did not revisit the reasons for the teams. Assistant principals knew little or nothing about the PP.

Professional Development

The teachers involved in the Partners Program had little or no training in some aspects of their experiences and expected needs for the pilot program. As discussed previously, the teachers were in relatively large high schools and all were members of relatively large curricular departments. Although nearly all of them had some aspect of junior high experience, only a few of them had experience at teaching in an interdisciplinary situation. Only three had taught in a team teaching situation. And yet, they were expected to know how teams worked and how they were effective. The expectation was that "they are all excellent and experienced teachers, they will figure this out" (Hannay & Denby, 1994; Panaritis, 1995). Indications during the research were that this did not necessarily occur. Several situations arose to better demonstrate problems in this area.

The teams had hoped for heterogeneous teaching and had tried to select a cross-section of abilities. Only the East High team came close to this approach. Their goals were honorable but their eventual first year experiences left them wondering and tired from trying to do so much with such a diverse group (Hammerness & Moffett, 1997; Siskin, 1997; Spies, 1996). Their diverse group included emotionally disruptive students integrated into their classes which they had not experienced on such a level. Sharon, team leader and math member, had not experienced the attempt to teach a heterogeneously grouped set of students in math (Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995). The problem became almost too much for her. As Andy Hargreaves, Wignall and Macmillan (1992) state, "Mixed ability grouping requires changes in teaching strategies which in turn requires professional development for teachers" (p. 5). The teachers were attempting this but without the advantage of any special assistance through professional development or through any type of consulting expertise. The math and LA teachers had taught leveled classes in the past and were experiencing heterogeneous classes within the PP; this caused stresses as indicated by them: frustrations with less feedback, frustrations with spending time on teaching several levels of math

in the same class, and frustrations of preparing students for "next year's classes and teachers" (Stodolsky & Grossman, 1995; Talbert & McLaughlin, 1993; Weiss, 1995).

When asked why they had not sought any type of assistance for the new situation, several reasons were given. First, they did not know what to expect. Second, when they had to confront the problems, they relied on each other rather than outside expert help. This is not unusual. As David Hargreaves (1980) has reported, when teachers encounter problems with mixed ability grouping, they do not seek help because of the cult of individualism:

> . . . the cult of individualism and the enhanced competence anxieties serve to inhibit the emergence of co-operative teacher solutions which are essential in the success of mixed ability grouping and leave many teachers working alone in a state of deep anxiety and stress, resorting to individual strategies for coping and surviving. (p. 145)

Sharon was faced with the many difficulties of the situation and yet relied only on her team without seeking any assistance elsewhere. Third, they did not know who to contact for expertise in team or group training. They had met with one middle school team but for only a brief time. The West team did meet with the science and math consultants from the LEA on a monthly basis but usually the consultants observed the team meeting and asked questions. This team and interdisciplinary approach was new to the consultants, as well.

Another concept that was new to most of the team members was the contacting of parents on a regular basis and involving themselves with family problems. They were accustomed to parental contact via the annual parent-teacher conferences, which in itself was a relatively new idea in all three high schools. This added expectation was a concern for most of the teachers. They talked about the lack of expertise they had for dealing with family problems and the stress this added to their personal teaching lives. The teachers mentioned the lack of training they had in this area and had suggested to the Assistant Superintendent for Development that this be addressed in future training. It is important to note that, in spite of increased parental contact by all high school teachers, either during parent-teacher conferences or as part of academic interventions, no type of professional development had taken place for anyone within the district. The need for this type of development, teacher-parent interactions, has been suggested (Blase, 1987b; Dembo & Gibson, 1985).

Another goal, interdisciplinary teaching, became problematic as the experience progressed. The overall personal expense to the teachers in terms of time and energy became overwhelming, although only the West team recognized this and scaled down their goals to what they considered a reasonable level. West abandoned the interdisciplinary attempt and accepted that this would take too much of their energies, not unlike what Dobbins (1971) had to say about a similar program: "Our goal was commendable, the task extremely taxing. . . . The problem is exacerbated by the charge to develop interdisciplinary content" (p. 519). As suggested by Dunne (1994) and Prestine (1994), to have change occur, particularly a complex change, requires help. More specifically, Panaritis (1995) states that it takes interdisciplinary "teams years to acquire . . . a working knowledge of what, when, and how their colleagues teach" (p. 24). The teams had gone into this with some avenues of help in the form of some extra funding, up-front planning time, and an extra planning period in their day, but there was no time or any extra funding set aside for training of the teachers before, or during, the implementation of the PP. They were left to their own devices and creativity to solve their individual and group problems (Scott, 1994).

One of the major problems which had developed during the first year of implementation had been the students. Students were no longer in the control of one teacher but of the three. The students were not "my" students but "our" students (Spies, 1994). The students became a concern beyond the traditional 55-minute class; they became a concern of the team of teachers for three-periods per day as well as 24-hours per day--something they were not accustomed to nor prepared for. They realized the lack of control they had of students well beyond their classrooms and the impact the outside was having on their school attendance and actions. This lack of control became even more stressful for the East team when the teachers realized the number of special needs, hyperactive students they had in their group. They were not accustomed to, nor trained for, "controlling" such students within their classrooms. They questioned their skills at dealing with students in a way they had not experienced since their "initiation years" as beginning teachers. McLaughlin (1993), reporting on research conducted for the Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching, states: "Teachers' comments about the aspects of their students that

had the greatest impact on their classroom practices focused on . . . the demands, difficulties and pressures associated with today's students." The teachers on the PP teams often spoke about the issues and problems they had to confront with their students in personal ways that had been unknown to them in the past, or had been neglected, because this had not been an expectation of them as classroom teachers (Talbert & McLaughlin, 1993). In a sense, they were experiencing a "role overload" (Cambone et al., 1992, p. 48).

The process of change for people is difficult, as attested by this case study and other stories contained in the large database covering this topic. Teachers go into the unknown with high hopes of success. They, however, become hardened to the results of the constant changes desired by others and yet they are expected to implement the innovation (Cambone et al., 1992; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Authors have written about the teacher as the center of this change process (Fullan, 1982; Sarason, 1971, 1982). But, as discussed by Andy Hargreaves (1992a), teachers are involved in a culture where they also need the support and verbal acknowledgment by their principals and leaders. This tangible knowledge is important for them as they struggle through the hardships of change. The teachers in this case believed this existed for the initial implementation period and then the support waned. Looking more closely at this situation is important because it also illustrates the micropolitical problems that existed at the support level of change. Change literature, particularly organizational change, has looked at the differences between first-order and second-order changes (Cuban, 1988). First-order changes represent "incremental modifications that make sense within an established framework or method of operation" (Bartunek & Moch, 1987, p. 484). Second-order changes "represent actual modifications of the framework itself, fundamental revisions and restructuring of interpretive schemes and bases of organizational understanding" (Prestine, 1994, p. 28). Key people in the PP--East and West High principals and district administrators--were hoping to use the PP as an impetus for a second-order, or systemic change, but without the explicit support needed for such a drastic change.

Both Assistant Superintendents set out hoping to change the way the high schools work--for one it was a more personal experience for teachers and students, the other hoped to see a change to

heterogeneous classes--and that the PP would be the catalyst for change. But, as has been noted by others, a systemic change requires a substantive redesign which throws open the culture of the schools (Dunne, 1994; Mirel, 1994; Muncey & McQuillan, 1996). None of this was taken into account. Dunne (1994) believes three assumptions for change must be considered: (a) desire does not transform tidily into change, (b) help helps, (c) change is ongoing and people involved need tools for this change. In retrospect, the Assistant Superintendent for Development--the person responsible for start-up funding and who had pushed for this pilot program--realized he had neglected all of these but could only move on with hopes that the PP teachers would accept the inevitable loss.

High School Culture

The teachers in this study were not unique in their reactions to the introduction and involvement in change, innovation, and restructuring. The literature is replete with examples of case studies about teachers at all levels undergoing the problem of innovation and/or restructuring (Aiken, 1942; Dobbins, 1971; Hammerness & Moffett, 1997; A. Hargreaves, 1992b; Kemis & Sorenson, 1997; Muncey & McQuillan, 1996; Redefer, 1950; Schwartz, 1971; Siskin, 1994; Wasley, 1994). Many of these cases deal with only the teachers and their reactions to, and the effects upon, the innovation during the process of implementation.

The teachers' interactions and relationships with their colleagues, both in their respective buildings and within their departments, place a major demand on them because of the innovation (Pray, 1969; Siskin, 1994; Weiss, 1995). Teachers are accustomed to the autocracy and power they wield within their own classrooms (Lieberman & Miller, 1978; Lortie, 1975; Peterson, 1966; Sarason, 1990; Waller, 1932). The teachers in this story, however, discovered they were powerless in the district and within their schools to control criticism from others. This was exemplified in several ways. First, collectively, they were not willing to be up-front with their own staffs about the PP because they feared resentment, criticism, and failure with their colleagues--that is, their participation would isolate them and, if the project failed, would reinforce the belief that change is doomed to fail (Panaritis, 1995). Second, jealousies from their colleagues came through

in various parts of the story--the extra computers, extra materials, extra planning time, the extra attention, the extra extras! Teachers are believers in egalitarianism (Lortie, 1975). This set the teams, and therefore the teachers, apart and made them vulnerable to comments by others. Before the PP had started, team members experienced some negative reactions from their department colleagues. The teachers stated that this did not bother them; they later reported the comments and pressure had subsided. Contrary to this, however, were comments by administrators and by Sharon, former team leader at East, that indicated many of the problems persisted throughout the three years.

David Hargreaves (1980) notes that "[occupational culture] has led us to underestimate the significance of the teachers' culture as a medium through which many innovations and reforms must pass; yet in that passage they frequently become shaped, transformed or resisted in ways that were unintended and unanticipated" (p. 126). Three key areas relating to the culture of high schools evolved throughout this study. In most situations, the participants were not aware of how the culture affected the implementation of the PP and the teachers themselves. However, all three were explicitly discussed by the different levels of the school district throughout the three years. First, was the attitude of the "middle school concept" being introduced to the high schools. Second, were the influence and cultural beliefs of the subject department members, particularly department chairs, on the innovation and the teachers themselves. And third, was the egalitarian beliefs of high school teachers. The following is a discussion of these three major issues relating to culture that arose for the team members within their schools during the two years of the study. In this case, the problems continued to be only part of the story rather than the story itself.

Middle School Attitude and High School Culture

The PP was intended to be an innovation to increase the success of 9th graders by offering a better transition for the students as they entered the traditional four year high school. This concept, however, was met with a common reaction by many of the high school teachers: a middle school concept moving into the high schools (Spies, 1995). This was said in a negative, demeaning way and reflected their perceptions on what middle schools meant: team teaching with a student-

centered approach by the teachers. Why would this elicit such negative reactions? As one informant stated, "Those who did not want to be in middle schools fought to get into the high schools during the transition [in the mid-1980s]."

The middle school approach is student-centered and teachers at this level tend to be developmental educators while those in junior high/high school are subject specialists and tend to prefer older pupils rather than "mothering younger ones" (A. Hargreaves, 1986, p. 207). Informal interviews supported this perspective, particularly among several department heads who felt it was not their "place to mother the high school students--they must sink or swim once in the high school." Their beliefs were that of subject specific and not student-centered (A. Hargreaves et al., 1992; D. Hargreaves, 1980). This is interesting to note because of the backgrounds of those teachers who were members of the PP teams. All but one had elementary and/or junior high experience and all had made some comment during interviews of being "student-centered." High school staff members who were not supportive of the program were fairly independent in their thinking of what school "should look like for students" and supported a departmentalized organization, not unlike what Mary Haywood Metz (1990) has described as perceptions for what is considered a "real school"--that is, the team members had strayed from what the other high school teachers perceived as the standard way of doing things.

The team teachers had a purpose of a student-centered philosophy, one in which they believed that, perhaps, they could make a personal difference in the success of 9th graders (Miller, 1990; Spies, 1994). This in itself is contrary to what has been found regarding many high school teachers who regard their positions as one of content specialist rather than being an advocate for the students (Stager & Fullan, 1992; Stiegelbauer, 1992). The participating teachers were motivated to be involved in a team-approach with high school students, a marked change for the oft described "impersonal" approach of large high schools (Sizer, 1984).

Teachers at various levels--elementary, middle and high school--are socialized groups within their respective settings (A. Hargreaves, 1992a; Siskin, 1994). At East, the staff had weathered the attempt of a previous administrator to introduce Mastery Learning and they were expecting to do

the same with the PP and team teaching. At North, the culture of quantitative results and AP classes did not mesh with a perception of the PP as a "wishy-washy" approach to learning which had no measurable results (Principal at North). The principal at West found himself trying to undo the autocratic culture which his predecessor had developed; he discovered a staff unfamiliar with a shared culture--the teachers were accustomed to instructions from the principal rather than left to their own creative devices.

The culture of a system prevents the invasion of innovation (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Dunne, 1994; Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995; Marshall, 1991; Sarason, 1971, 1982; Weiss, 1995). In this case, the teachers were part of a high school group and the idea of moving a "middle school" concept to the high school was antithetical to the sub-culture of departments and separate subject areas (A. Hargreaves, 1992a, 1994; Little, 1995a, 1995b). It is the "culture" of high schools which can make change difficult because of the marginalization of any members who attempt to defect to another system and the departments themselves create a culture of separation (Johnson, 1990; Prestine, 1994; Riseborough, 1981; Siskin, 1990, 1991). It was these "sub-cultures" that had one of the greatest impacts on the teachers themselves.

Influence of Departments: A Sub-Culture

"Because of its large and differentiated nature, the high school is, in fact, particularly vulnerable to the informal balkanization of its teachers. This is why agreed whole-school policies are so difficult to secure in that setting" (A. Hargreaves, 1992a, p. 223). The high school subject area and department structure itself creates its own culture (Goodson, 1983, 1988; A. Hargreaves, 1992a, 1994). Andy Hargreaves (1994) has called this the "balkanized form of teacher cultures" (p. 213). He identifies four characteristics for these cultures: (a) low permeability (groups strongly insulated from each other), (b) high permanence (existence and membership are clearly delineated in space and strong permanence over time, e.g., primary teachers, chemistry, Special Education), (c) personal identification or socialization into a group--" . . . singular identification with particular sub-groups undermines capacity for empathy and collaboration with others" (p. 214), and (d)

political complexion: "Teacher sub-cultures are not merely sources of identity and meaning. They are repositories of self-interest as well" (p. 214).

An attempt to set up a core group of teachers in the high school, such as the PP, can expect to face problems because of the strong subject identities (D. Hargreaves, 1980; Johnson, 1990; Little, 1995). In the case of all three schools, the culture of departments and content importance was very obvious. At all three high schools, the math departments were concerned about coverage and preparation for the next level, to the point that Sharon at East spent the last month of the year preparing students for the next year's math teachers: " . . . we still feel responsible to have the kids with certain skills by the end of the year" (Sharon). Science department chairs at both East and North High Schools were not favorable toward the PP concept. The chair at North eventually accepted the idea but did not support it, and the chair at East used his influence to prevent a science teacher from participating (Little, 1995a; Siskin, 1991).

These problems should not be surprising, for two reasons. First, "The increased size of departments and the emphasis on producing 'success' measured in public examination success rates will reinforce subject expertise against the weak classification required in the integrated code" (D. Hargreaves, 1980, p. 144). Second, the principal at North, as the educational leader, pressed hard for the outward measures of success in visible data which he did not see in the PP (Edmonds, 1979; Lezotte, personal communication, June 27, 1991; Louis & Miles, 1990).

One desired outcome for the PP innovation was a change in the way high school teachers interacted with each other. Both Assistant Superintendents were hoping for a loss of isolation and an increase in collaboration between teachers. The principal at East likewise was hoping for more communication between teachers. This aspect succeeded for the team members; however, the high school balkanized cultures marginalized and reputed the need for the interdisciplinary core groups.

> Schools with innovative programs which try to establish core groupings of students and schools-within-schools, for instance, might destabilize existing department structures. And schools deliberately seeking to develop collaborative work cultures across departments may also lead to interesting modifications in the traditional balkanized pattern. (A. Hargreaves et al., 1992, p. 8)

As these authors surmise, the collaborative culture may breach the bulkhead of the traditional balkanized high school cultures. The findings of other authors are also not as optimistic for the effect of a school-within-a-school approach to change because of its attendant problems (Hammerness & Moffett, 1997; Muncey & McQuillan, 1996; Timar, 1990; Wasley, 1994). In this case, the departments, particularly the core subjects, marginalized the PP to prevent this from occurring.

Another related aspect for culture was the reluctance of experimentation. Most of the teachers and administrators reported a lack of interest in trying things differently. The academic departments were secure in what had been done in the past and the teachers desired the same. The department community, however, has the greatest significance on teachers for their norms of practice, and attitudes about teaching and students (McLaughlin, 1993). Little's (1982) research in particular suggests that innovation and improvement are likely to succeed only where "norms of collegiality and experimentation" already exist among the staff of the school. Several teachers and principals mentioned the aging of their staffs and unwillingness to change. They also knew their colleagues spoke about "the cycle of reform and the PP innovation was just part of the cycle." At least one team member talked about her own involvement in team teaching when she first entered the teaching profession in the early 70s; the PP for her was a return to team teaching but in a different way. The teachers had a feeling from the beginning that the "cycle" would occur and the PP would be a part of the cycle once again.

> I do think [the PP] will be short lived until we get people who are convinced that they want to share, want to work together. . . . I just [believe our staff] thinks it's kind of a "one more little thing we do in education that, if you wait ten years, it will go away." (Team member at West)

The PP would fail just as everything else in the cycle had before it and the same would happen to any future innovations (LeCompte & Dworkin, 1991). In informal interviews, teachers were not necessarily against change, per se, but not in favor of this kind of change--the culture of departments as well as the merged culture of the junior high and high school, a traditional system, was a greater issue in controlling any change (A. Hargreaves, 1986).

The preferred culture, such as collaboration in schools that was desired by the principals at East and West, was against the prevailing context of teachers work (A. Hargreaves, 1991; Little, 1982). In the case of the teams, they were given an extra period designed for collaborating about students and their three subject areas. This was contrary to the context of how teachers work and against the traditional situation of teaching one less class.

> When I first came to West, there was a philosophy here that every man was his own island, so to speak. And, while there was collegiality amongst the department members, for example, you pretty much did your own thing in isolation from everybody else. That was foreign to me. Having been nurtured in the elementary and junior high setting, I worked with people all the time; and it was, it was culture shock, I'll call it, for me to come here [to the high school]. (Team Leader at West)

Teachers talked about their collaboration within the teams as being much different than discussions they would have with colleagues in the lounge or office. Teaming brought out professional, in-depth conversations rather than the typical surficial, anecdotal talk about students (A. Hargreaves, 1992a; Lieberman & Miller, 1978). They enjoyed this professional aspect of their PP experience and realized this as a strong positive part of the team concept. Again, however, the culture of the "balkanized" subject areas interceded for any effective long term aspects of this interchange.

The participants and the Assistant Superintendent for Development, who developed the PP, were bothered by the lack of interest shown by the other high school teachers, the negative reactions by colleagues, and the mounted pressure by many department heads toward the PP. The cultures of the subject areas greatly influenced how the team was perceived and how other teachers reacted to them. Their approach to students was different: they certainly knew much more about their group of students than many other teachers in their buildings. As reported by Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp, high schools have a segmentation of departments which do not have an articulated view of students leading to a lack of sense for a student's progress through school. Also, because of subject matter specialization, teachers share less tasks and experiences (Louis et al., 1994). These also contributed to the isolation the teams experienced. And, in respect to the lack of interest, the teachers themselves had wanted silence about the teams for fear of the reactions, the "cultural" responses, they would receive from their colleagues. As has been noted by others (A.

Hargreaves et al., 1992; Muncey & McQuillan, 1996) change similar to the PP was successful in small high schools in which the ties within departments were weak.

Another aspect of the high school culture readily explains problems encountered by individuals within the teams. The concept behind the PP could threaten the status quo of departments or weaken their present strength (Johnson, 1990). The teachers involved with the development of the PP had the intention of providing some special attention for average students by developing a heterogeneous 9th grade approach (A. Hargreaves et al., 1992; Miller, 1990). As the West team noted, they wanted this to be the Extended Learning Program (ELP) for the masses. There were special classes for the AP-type students and classes for the special-needs students, but what was special for the average students? The teams had set out with the goal of not only being student-centered but also to make this group of students feel "special" within their settings. A problem that became more obvious as this study evolved, however, was the enculturated tracking at all three high schools. This was readily admitted by the principals at North and East, and the Assistant Superintendent for High Schools.

For at least the East team, which was attempting heterogeneous classes, some internal conflicts arose within the math department. The math department members were not in favor of mixed grouping and were not in favor of Sharon (team leader and math teacher) participating in the team program. The principal acknowledged the department's concern about any change away from ability grouping, a model which he believed was "the easy way for them to teach math, not necessarily the best way to teach for the students." The PP certainly threatened the established program of ability grouping practiced within the math department (A. Hargreaves, 1986; A. Hargreaves et al., 1992; Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995; Siskin, 1991, 1994). The principal at North High had a different rationale for math and the PP: "My philosophy on this school is not in concert with the national trend that vigorously opposes all leveling and tracking. I do not accept that point of view." He also mentioned that math was leveled because of the sequential manner of the subject and he had not allowed above average students from being in the PP at North; these students would have been in all upper level classes which would have caused parental problems.

Andy Hargreaves and Macmillan (1994) call this the "political complexion" or repositories of self-interest (p. 214). Riseborough (1981) has similarly noted that major innovations may divide teachers into supporters who will benefit from the innovation, and opponents who may not gain anything by it. Ball (1987) likewise has discussed how the dynamics of power and self-interest within such cultures are major determinants of how teachers behave as a community. In this case, the math department's self-interests were certainly threatened by such an innovation. How did the teams attempt to deal with this issue?

The three teams did not intentionally set out with this issue as a goal but certainly ran into the ramifications of dealing with this. The West team had problems with at least one of their members working with a group of students that were, according to the math department chair, below his ability level. In other words, he was being wasted at the 9th grade level and would best serve students in upper level classes (Ball, 1987; Cambone et al., 1992; A. Hargreaves, 1994; A. Hargreaves et al., 1992; Riseborough, 1981; Talbert, 1995). The team at East encountered problems because they were attempting heterogeneous classes in math, an approach strongly opposed by the math department members. At North, the teachers had the problem of not having the best students in a "heterogeneous" class because of perceived parent pressure for students to be in more challenging classes (Johnson, 1990; Metz, 1990). This meant their children were not to be in classes for average or below average students. The "tradition" had been for ability grouped classes for many years (Tye, 1985).

> But in North Bend in the '60s there would have still been just as much tracking as there is at this point. . . . This district had a very strong tracking propensity. And so to me, the heterogeneous grouping at East is a major breakthrough. Because even while we were in junior high, the tracking of 7th, 8th and 9th grade was horrendous. (Assistant Superintendent for High Schools)

Concerns with this approach came across in formal and informal interviews of teachers within the buildings. A major issue became the differentiation of staff responsibilities and funding. Teachers were concerned that the AP classes were receiving priority in the schools, represented by smaller classes, on the average, than the non-AP classes. Teachers of regular classes sometimes had to bring in extra chairs for their classes (perhaps 35 or more students) and yet saw AP classes

with enrollments in the mid- to upper-teens. These classes were most often taught by department chairs or the academically, specialized teachers (Allen, cited in Riseborough, 1981; Ball, 1987; Riseborough, 1981).

Andy Hargreaves (1992a, 1994) terms the status between certain subjects as the "high and low status subjects"--the academic and practical subjects which also represent the high and low status knowledge (Apple, 1990; Goodson, 1983). In a similar way, teachers in this study were cognizant of the different status given to regular and AP classes. The AP classes had the better students and smaller class sizes which gave the other teachers an advantage with discipline and time. This played out in other areas that were implicitly expressed by teachers. These teachers had fewer students but the funding was equal, whether there were fifteen students or thirty-five students--in this sense, more funding was allocated to the academic areas (Byrne, 1974; Siskin, 1994). This ratio also gave the teachers of smaller, academic classes more time-per-student as well as fewer demands for class preparation which was perceived with inequity by other teachers. Unfortunately, as expressed by the teachers and at least two principals, the high SES parents were the ones most apt to be concerned about the placement of their child in advanced classes rather than the average classroom because of their desire for these classes as college preparatory (A. Hargreaves, 1992b).[5]

A hidden agenda by the Assistant Superintendent for High Schools for the PP had been for a systemic change to occur and abolish this old system of tracking and teaching. Unfortunately, tracking was part of the "culture" of the district and he had to admit the possibility of changing this looked very bleak as the funding period drew to an end. As Stager and Fullan (1992) stated, "The change agenda for the future must revisit the age-old problem of whether the educational system is a passive reflection of society, or an active agent of societal change" (p. 211). In this case, however, contrary to the hopes of Stager and Fullan, the system continued to reflect society rather than change society. The PP teachers had hoped their program would be a means of changing some aspects of the students' involvement with school and change some aspects of this situation by being student-centered (Johnson, 1990). But, as they realized, the change was difficult. Unfortunately, they were not cognizant of the levels of change they were attempting within the

culture of strong, high status departments (Goodson, 1983; Grossman & Stodolsky, 1994; Johnson, 1990).

Egalitarian Beliefs--"Favored Teachers"

Another aspect of "political complexion," as Andy Hargreaves and Macmillan (1994, p. 169) label it, is the haves and have-nots, or "favored group" (Cambone, 1995; Miller, 1990). The PP teachers began the first year of implementation with added extras for development of the program (Panaritis, 1995). They were happy to receive these specials because they believed the extras would certainly help them in their approaches. At East, a few extras were a computer loaned to them, a rearrangement of room locations, and student selection; for the West team, they received graphing calculators and were allowed to select students; for the North team, they had one room change but, again, just their involvement was an issue. For all the teams, the extra planning period was an extra that most colleagues outside of the teams did not understand, nor readily accepted, as problems regarding funding and student ratios developed within the district. And in all locations, the perception existed that the teams had been given the better students to work with as part of the program, even though this was not true (Aschbacher, 1992; Muncey & McQuillan, 1996).

These reactions should have been expected and anticipated. Blase (1987a) found that "principals who practiced favoritism toward 'selected' teachers precipitated feelings of anger, jealousy, suspicion, and futility among the faculty" (p. 294). Muncey and McQuillan (1996) have termed teachers in this position as having problems with "political naiveté" for not realizing what would potentially occur when receiving extras outside of the established norms for the group. In their study, Muncey and McQuillan also found that extras seemed to alienate people more from a school-within-a-school innovation. Lortie (1975) states: "Teachers continue to oppose internal differentiation in rewards on grounds other than seniority or education" (p. 102). Other case studies support the problems that teachers have when perceived as being the "favored ones" or receiving extras compared to other teachers (Mirel, 1994; Stapleford, 1994). The culture of the high school is an egalitarian belief for materials and recognition, in spite of what actually occurs

(Cambone et al., 1992); however, as discussed earlier, the equality seemed to end when comparing AP classes and the caseloads involved with the average ability classes.

Stapleford (1994), in his study of reform in two high schools, discussed three crucial ingredients for change that were problems for the district leadership. These three were political problems, financial limitations, and administrative support. In this case study, the financial support waned after three years--a situation not unusual (Aschbacher, 1992; Corwin, 1983; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; LeCompte & Dworkin, 1991). The administrative support, as discussed earlier, existed in part by two principals and two central district administrators. When choices had to be made, this support also waned. Political support existed in name only. The school board had explicitly gone on record as supporting team teaching but did not politically become involved in the hard choice to continue the PP. These various aspects of support--political, financial, emotional, and physical--were contributing factors to the problems that existed. However, in spite of these situations, the teachers themselves were willing to continue the Partners Program and did so in some manner within one of the schools. The following tells their story of how and why they continued as well as expanded within West High School.

West High and the Continuation of the Partners

The team at West High, in spite of the cultural problems presented by the subject departments and perceptions concerning a lack of support, has continued. The team actually spawned a second team during the third year (1993-1994). That team lasted only one year, primarily for two reasons: one member (a new teacher to the district) moved out of state for another teaching position, and another member retired due to health. Losing two of the three members spelled the loss of this second team. However, this year (1997-1998) a second team developed for the ninth grade. Their rationale is the same as the "trailblazing" team and, ironically, similar to the original East and North teams with the integration of a service learning component.

In talking to members of both teams, the reason for wanting such an approach is the commitment to seeing that students succeed. As both members of the original team said, this is the best thing for the students and "we know it works!" As they continue to observe attendance

patterns for the PP students and their non-PP students, the team members firmly believe "that this is superior." As I continued to talk with these two original members of the team, they practically talked in unison as I asked why they stay together, what this has meant to them, and what it has meant to students as well as parents. Even though the original math member was forced to retire due to health reasons, both talked about the stability of their team. Both have been at West for well over a decade and are committed to staying there. The "new" member had been a part of the team for five years now and, like them, is committed to remaining at West. They have worked together now for eight years, are compatible, and "can easily flow--change the schedule, rearrange students, and such with no difficulty." They continue to believe in and enjoy working with the same group of students.

What was most interesting in this conversation was their willingness to continue the PP and, for the first time, doing so without a common planning time. This had been lost to them this year because of the "computer driving the system". The Associate Principal, in charge of scheduling, was not willing to designate a common prep period for the three (which is interesting in light of the fact that the newest group had convinced the Associate Principal of their need for such coordinated time). In this case, as both members mentioned, they were already known to be doing a good job and they knew what they would be doing without having to do the common plan to discuss this. However, a key goal of the PP seemed to be slipping away: a common time to discuss shared students and their problems. Now they were left to discuss any integration or problems during lunch when two members of the team could meet; it then became the responsibility of one of them to quickly inform the third member as they walked back to class. They did say this was very discouraging for them; it seemed they were only maintaining the status quo instead of doing anything new with their students. And, with a difficult group of students reminiscent of their first year, they did not believe students had settled into the program as easily this year. The lack of common planning time had taken away a great deal of the "affect" for the PP.

Both members acknowledged continued positive feedback from parents during parent-teacher conferences. They still had parents asking for their children to be part of the PP. An interesting

point was that the program continued to be a refuge for West High teachers' children as they moved into the high school. In fact, this year the team had the Principal's step-son--not at all an accident from their perspective.

But I also found weariness in their eyes and voices. They knew the Principal still supported the idea but the lack of support with scheduling by the Associate Principal sent them a different message. A second issue with scheduling surfaced this year for the first time with the West team, although this had been an issue with the North team five years ago: students participating in only part of the PP classes. This too was sending the team members a different message and creating other problems for them with their ability to be flexible with their own scheduling. Another point they made was that the idea of interdisciplinary approaches to teaching was now part of the school improvement goals. And yet, the team and members were receiving recognition only when it seemed the administration needed to cite an example for the Improvement Plan being met in some tangible fashion; this was not unlike what they believed five years ago for the Principal's self-interest in the program. Some things did appear to have changed over the five years since I had last visited with them but not in the positive way everyone had hoped.

As Weiss (1995) has discussed, teaching and the students were the key to these teachers--"I think this is worth it for the kids" (West team member). They did what they did out of a personal conviction: this was truly what was best for the students! Even with a difficult group this year, they found that the students had become comfortable with each other and seemed to "feel connected because of the stability" which the PP provided.

What came through in discussions with this team and the other former team members at the other schools was another goal of the PP: the camaraderie, both from sharing ideas about students and the subjects, and the discussions and loss of isolation they had achieved by being members of such a team approach (Kruse & Louis, 1995; Spies, 1996). The PP at West continues to wax and wane, not because of any specific support given to them but because of their own commitment to a teaching approach which they firmly believe meets the needs of their students (Weiss, 1995). They also have found security and "like-mindedness" (Little, 1995b, p. 175). The West team, which has

endured for seven years, thought much alike in their philosophy of teaching and dealing with students and parents. But how much longer can this continue without stronger visible and concrete support from the administration?

Discussion

As I reflect on the teams after studying all three and their contexts, first for over two years and then revisiting them five years later, I find much to wonder and think about relative to not only changes in them but about educational change itself. The phrase which continues to return to my mind is the predictable failure of educational reform (Sarason, 1990). Two key issues have surfaced relative to my initial findings of culture and support. These are context and self-interests. What appears to be true in this study, and I believe to be true in any in-depth study of change, is that all of these issues are intertwined to challenge and prevent the concept of educational change. I have been able, through a lengthy ethnographic study, to observe the evolution and unfolding of the context and the imbedded nature of self-interests: self-interests driven by personal beliefs of students and self-interests driven by internal (department and culture for teachers/schools, and hopes for change by administrators) and external (parents' influence on administrators) factors. Context issues are not only district but building, department, and individual as are also the cultures and sub-cultures within each of the individual settings (Grossman & Stodolsky, 1994).

One aspect of self-interest by the teachers in this study and their teaming approach reflect a belief in a better way of teaching and learning (Panaritis, 1995) and, in the case of the teams, a better way of working together to make students successful (Spies, 1994) and improving relationships between teachers and students (Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996). The teachers believed in this and still do. The following statement by a former team member at East High summarizes what all teachers had to say: "It was really, really hard but tremendous energy and tremendous satisfaction. It is one of the highlights of what I've done as a teacher. I would do it again. . . . I am very, very sad it was not given a chance to continue." Certainly, belief in this approach kept one team going based on their own fortitude.

As this paper represents, these problems were exemplified in ways such as: administrative support at North was non-existent based on his perceived needs of parents, subject/department

sub-cultures in all three schools presented barriers, and self-interests of participating and non-participating teachers as well as administrators at all levels were problematic. The importance of support from administrators, particularly those in charge of what is important to teachers, cannot be understated and underestimated. The key issue of time played out in two ways. First, time was for working together, whether an extra planning period or just a common planning period. Unfortunately, the teams ran into conflicts and problems with counselors who believed problems had developed with student scheduling; another issue with scheduling was with those who design the schedule in the three high schools, the associate principals. The second way was how time in the form of duration was not allowed to determine if it could be successful at all locations. This form of time is up to both building and central district administrators--much as Spiës (1996) and Siskin (1995) discuss.

This comes back to the key point of context as several researchers have reported. The various problems were different in each building. Counselors were willing to work with the West team (and still meet with both the new and existing team to deal with student problems) and worked with the team at North. This was not true of the East team where counselors found the PP to be nothing but problems for scheduling students. Another issue, which appears to continue its evolution at West, is the continued growth of AP classes (modeled after that which is currently existing at North High and instituted there by the mentor of the West High principal). The context of each high school building created different problems for each team. At East High the sub-culture of departments and "ownership" of certain areas of the building (Siskin, 1991, 1995) created problems for the East team when other teachers discovered the team was housed in an alcove of the building which necessitated the relocation of two teachers out of the department area--again related to the context and self-interest due to sub-cultures in departments. Context at East included a science department chair protective of his department and prevented any science teachers from participating. The principal at this site supported the team and concept (he was one of the initiators) but an aging staff and non-supportive counseling group set up different demands and problems. North High encountered similar problems with the science department chair and had no support

from their principal; however, the ninth-grade counselor worked with students and student schedules to assist the team.

Unfortunately, various types of extra support, such as all the extras as suggested by Panaritis (1995) are a two edged sword. The extras are needed to represent support but how does one then deal with the egalitarian beliefs of teachers and the cultures of the subjects? Siskin (1995) discusses the problems of strong and weak, or "privileged", departments which accept the idea they will receive more dollars because of their status. But what happens when someone else receives extras? This created problems for the teams in this study, particularly the East team, much as Muncey and McQuillan (1996) discovered in their study of the Coalition of Essential Schools.

Support comes in another way which was discussed more by the teams today rather than five years ago. What else is going on "out there" that is similar to "us"? How do we find out about them? Share ideas? As Sizer (personal communication, November 10, 1990) has learned from Ralph Tyler, teachers involved in change and innovation such as in this study need like-minded people with whom they can discuss ideas. Thus, the Coalition of Essential Schools has intentionally tried to bring in schools to the Coalition in regional or geographic areas for "conversation" to exist. The teachers in this study initially needed and desired such a situation for conversation, and continue to want to have that opportunity. Thus, two members of the former East team, along with two like-minded teachers there, have formed their own small group, called "Good Ideas Club", to discuss educational ideas and share the latest articles and literature. This is not unlike what Siskin (1995) has discussed about like-minded teachers finding each other in schools and departments; Louis (1995) discusses the need and possibilities for teachers to create their own structures for collaboration for a chance at change.

Why does such an approach need to be taken to study what might be different in education? As stated earlier, much has ben studied about educational change and innovation with little success of change occurring. This paper discusses, in one fashion, the problem Cambone, Weiss and Wyeth (1992) state that "there is a strong sense among teachers of conserving the status quo in the face of young zealots" (p. 28) (see also Muncey and McQuillan, 1996). All members who were willing to

participate, both in the original teams as well as the additional teams, were teachers who had "moved up" to the high school and/or had left teaching at some time and then returned, or were new, young teachers. These teachers were not as "enculturated" into the departments' sub-cultures as other long time members had been--Cambone et al., 1992, discuss teachers who "have learned their place in the hierarchy" (p. 16); Little, Siskin, Stodolsky and Grossman discuss in their writings how department strengths, sub-cultures, and norms influence individuals as members; however, they do not address two related issues: how members may remain independent in their thinking within strong cultures, or how long it may take for cultural norms to influence teachers. Teachers in this study were willing to be involved in change, follow their self-interests for teaching students, whether it failed or not (Lortie, 1975), yet, as in the case of the West team, were willing to ignore the pressures placed on them by a strong sub-culture of their own departments.

Math was problematic in all three schools. The math teacher at West High was strong willed and cared more for his self-interest of working with a team and children than the self-interest of the math chair and department. Contrary to the math departments, the English teachers on all three teams had, at least, passive support or visible support from their department colleagues and chairs. As detailed by Grossman and Stodolsky (1994, 1995) and Talbert (1995), English as a subject is much less sequential and thus more accepting of such a design. Therefore, the English teachers did not face the department problems experienced by the math participants. As stated above, the background of all participants is part of context and self-interest: they had moved up to the high school or had previous experiences elsewhere--the culture of the departments had less affect on them.

Another point that is brought up in change literature is how to go about change. Spies (1994) states that change must come from the "grassroots" or bottom-up. This again relates to Fullan's comment that change depends on teachers. Raywid (1997) discusses the importance of bottom-up and top-down involvement. This represents the important positions for both teachers and administrators in change. Even this perspective does not guarantee anything. The PP was a bottom-up design in terms of teachers, albeit a small number, deciding the approach and design for

the team concept. In essence, as teachers they were given the authority to do what was educationally defensible (Gitlin & Margonis, 1995), both in the design of the program and how they dealt with their students as a team. The idea of some type of needed change came from the top, a building principal and an assistant superintendent. Unfortunately, as the micro-political lens has shown, there are many self-interests and ideologies involved in change for each level had their own agendas and self-interests involved. This became more evident for other central district administrators and principals as the two year process evolved.

As Huberman (1993) has stated, "Traditional form of schooling is a complex, coherent, and resilient ecosystem . . . [with] an awesome capacity to wait out and wear out reformers" (p. 44). Fullan (1982) has implied that teachers are at the basis of what happens in change, and it is as simple and complex as that. For the team at West this may be a truism. Fullan has discussed further that change is a complex set of issues and problems that are all part of the complexity of change. This case study has shown that change is very complex. It is more than a technical problem requiring a technical approach. As a micropolitical view indicates, change requires a technical, cultural, and political approach--all must be dealt with in the process of change (Tychy, 1983).

Additionally, systemic change requires a contextual approach. Schools are interconnected systems and the entire structure must be attended to when attempting a major change (Raywid, 1990; Sarason, 1990; Sizer, 1984). At the same time, the individual site and setting must be considered (Cuban, 1988; Iannaccone, 1991; McLaughlin, 1990; Pink & Borman, 1994; Sizer, 1984) and the context for the individual involved, as well (Stodolsky & Grossman, 1995). Sarason (1971, 1982) argues that reform often fails because change agents disregard such factors as the culture of schools, the behavioral and programmatic regularities within schools, the insights of administrators, and the degree to which teachers are willing to join the process of change. He maintains that unless reformers build constituencies for change both within the schools and within the community, most reform efforts will fail. A careful look at the process used for this hoped-for reform reveals that essentially all aspects as suggested by Sarason were ignored.

I set out in this case study to view the change process of innovation through a different, more in-depth lens and to search for the "why's" of failed change and reform. I followed this innovation through its three years of funding, as well as five years after its demise, interviewing and discussing the process with the key actors involved with the ongoing implementation of the PP teams. This longevity provided the opportunity to observe and understand the politics, both micro- and macro-, that occurred during the implementation of this innovation.

The culture and sub-cultures of the department/subject areas had a strong influence on teachers and change and represented some semblance of political achievement within this study. The culture of the departments placed pressure on teachers to not participate, or to stay within the bounds of the cultural expectations for the traditional school setting--the "tight fences" (North Team member). The department chairs exerted their influence to restrict, as much as possible, student selection and teacher participation in the PP (Grossman & Stodolsky, 1994; Little, 1995a; Siskin, 1991). Although these "cultures" are strong and influence how teachers act and learn within their respective departments (A. Hargreaves, 1986, 1992a; D. Hargreaves, 1980; Talbert & McLaughlin, 1993), this factor alone was not influential enough to stop the innovation. The team members, as they had stated and showed by their actions, wanted to continue the PP without the support of the departments and their colleagues as demonstrated by the team(s) at West High. Marginalization had occurred within their respective schools and yet the teachers were willing to continue a program they believed was succeeding in the ways they had intended with the 9th grade transition problem. In essence, the culture of the departments limited participation but did not cause the innovation to fail.

As Noblit, Berry, and Dempsey (1991) state, "The close study of micropolitics also suggests that implementation and innovation studies can be reinterpreted. This reinterpretation tells a story not of failed intent, but of political achievement" (p. 393). The teams may not have succeeded in two of the three schools; however, the culture of the schools continued as they were, much as Siskin had predicted in 1994: ". . . efforts which aim at restructuring, without attending to the firmly entrenched identities of subject specialists, risk unexpected conflict and resistance" (p. 10).

Since the PP did not expand, as had been desired by PP teachers and some administrators, political achievement had been achieved by departments and subject specialists (Grossman & Stodolsky, 1994). As reformers continue to support interdisciplinary teams or "learning teams" (Spies, 1994), the subject communities must be considered in the process (Little, 1995b). As this studied has shown with three sites within the same school district, the subject areas and sub-cultures have a tremendous covert and overt influence on what happens within the individual school and individual department. Support by administrators is a tenuous problem: What is too little, or too much? The context of each building, each situation, and each individual is different. And, this context takes on many descriptors: time, preferential room assignments, locations, materials, preferred treatment, self-efficacy, self -interests, department support, peer support, etc. Context has as much to do with success and failure as does the teachers and their self-interests, whether these are driven from within (personal) or from without (sub-cultures, students, parents). Perhaps change is not quite as simple as what teachers do and think.

---

[1] These are all pseudonyms.

[2] The three team leaders decided upon this approach after a half-year of research and attendance at a Coalition of Essential Schools Fall Forum. They did not know of any similarly designed teams until I told them about ninth-grade teams in the Eastern U.S. I had either talked to team members &/or administrators via phone at three locations in Maine and one in Florida during the spring/summer of 1992. I informed the PP members about these teams during their second year as a pilot program. Since then, Spies (1994, 1995, 1996) has written about "learning teams" which have the same design and goals as the PP; likewise, Derrickson (1995) has written about an at-risk ninth-grade program with nearly identical goals. At the time of this research study, however, the PP leaders and team members believed they were alone and breaking new ground.

[3] The other two findings are: The site-based leadership structure of the district allowed the individual principals to decide the fate of the innovation. This was so even in the face of the desires of various central administrators to continue the innovation and to even use it as a catalyst for further change in the high schools. Finally, the influence and power of the more affluent members of the community, as exercised through the most powerful of the three principals, had a direct and decisive role in the ending of the innovation. These two findings are discussed in a paper which has been submitted for publication; the latter finding is discussed in a paper presented at AERA, New Orleans, 1994.

[4] For a discussion of the importance of teachers to be the leaders for change with peers, see Panaratis (1995).

[5] A. Hargreaves (1997) and Little (1992b) discuss parents and their influence on teachers for the continuation of a traditional curriculum.

REFERENCES

Adelman, D.E., Walking Eagle, K.P. & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.) (1997). Racing with the clock: Making time for teaching and learning in school reform. New York: Teachers College Press.

Aikin, W. M. (1942). The story of the eight year study, Volume I. New York: Harper & Brothers.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (1989). Project 2061: Science for all Americans. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science, Inc.

Apple, M. W. (1990). Ideology and curriculum (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc.

Aschbacher, P. (1992). Humanitas program evaluation: Institutionalization of the humanitas program--Final report. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Ball, S. J. (1987). The micro-politics of the school: Towards a theory of school organization. London: Methuen/Routledge.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191-215.

Bartunek, J. M., & Moch, M. K. (1987). First-order, second-order, and third-order change and organizational development interventions: A cognitive approach. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 23, 483-500.

Blase, J. J. (1987a). Political interactions among teachers: Sociocultural context in the schools. Urbn Education, 22, 286-308.

*Blase, J. J. (1987b). The politics of teaching: The teacher-parent relationship and the dynamics of diplomacy. Journal of Teacher Education, 38, 53-60.

Blase, J. J. (1991). The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Blase, J. J., & Kirby, P. C. (1992). Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Byrne, E. M. (1974). Planning and educational inequality: A study of the reationale of resource-allocation. Slough, Great Britain: NFER Pubishing Company Ltd.

Cambone, J. (1995). Time for teachers in school restructuring. Teachers College Record, 96, 512-543.

Cambone, J., Weiss, C.H. & Wyeth, A. (1992). We're not programmed for this: An exploration of the variance between the ways teachers think and the concept of shared decision making in high schools. Occasional Paper No. 17. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Cawelti, G. (1995). High school restructuring: What are the critical elements? NASSP Bulletin, 79(569), 1-15.

Common, D. L. (1983). Power: The missing concept in the dominant model of school change. Theory Into Practice, 22, 203-210.

Corwin, R. G. (1983). The entrepreneurial bureaucracy: Biographies of two federal programs in education. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.

Crandall, D. P., & Loucks, S. F. (1983). A roadmap for school improvement. Executive summary of the study of dissemination efforts supporting school improvement. People, policies, & practices: Examining the chain of school improvement, Vol. X. Andover, MA: Network of Innovative Schools, Inc.

Cuban, L. (1988). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 340-344.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Dembo, M. H., & Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers' sense of efficacy: An important factor in school improvement. The Elementary School Journal, 86, 173-184.

Derrickson, D. A. (1995). At-risk ninth-grade students and the perception of success. Teaching and change, 2(4), 352-368.

Dobbins, A. L. (1971). Instruction at Adams. Phi Delta Kappan, 52, 516-519.

Dunne, F. (1994, April). From the inside out: Creating collaborative school cultures by building local capacity. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Edmonds, R. R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37, 15-24.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1990). Change processes in secondary schools: Toward a more fundamental agenda. In M. W. McLaughlin, J. E. Talbert, & N. Bascia (Eds.), The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities (pp. 224-255). New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gitlin, A. & Margonis, F. (1995). The political aspect of reform: Teacher resistance as good sense. American Journal of Education, 103, 377-405.

Goodson, I. F. (1983). School subjects and curriculum change. London: Croom Helm Ltd.

Goodson, I. F. (1988). The making of curriculum. New York: Falmer Press.

Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. B., & Bernstein, M. (1971). Implementing organizational innovations: A sociological analysis of planned educational change. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Grossman, P.L. & Stodolsky, S.S. (1994). Considerations of content and the circumstances of secondary school teaching. In Linda Darling Hammond (Ed.), Review of Research in Education (pp. 179-221). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Grossman, P.L. & Stodolsky, S.S. (1995). Content as context: The role of school subjects in secondary school teaching. Educational Researcher, 24(8), 5-11, 23.

Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hammerness, K. & Moffett, K. (1997, March). The subjects of debate: Teachers' clashing and overlapping beliefs about subject matter during a whole-school reform. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in practice. New York: Routledge.

Hannay, L. M. & Denby, M. (1994, April). Secondary school change: The role of department heads. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Hargreaves, A. (1986). Two cultures of schooling: The case of middle schools. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press

Hargreaves, A. (1991). Contrived collegiality. In J. Blase (Ed.), The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation (pp. 46-72). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hargreaves, A. (1992a). Cultures of teaching: A focus for change. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.), Understanding teacher development (pp. 216-240). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1992b). Roxborough High School: A traditional suburban secondary school. In A. Hargreaves, J. Davis, M. Fullan, R. Wignall, M. Stager, & R. Macmillan (Eds.), Secondary school work cultures and educational change (pp. 23-43). Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1997). Rethinking educational change: Going deeper and wider in the quest for success. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), 1997 ASCD Yearbook: Rethinking educational change with heart and mind. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hargreaves, A., & Macmillan, R. (1994). The balkanization of teaching: Collaboration that divides. In A. Hargreaves, Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age (212-240). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A., Wignall, R., & Macmillan, R. (1992). Background to the study. In A. Hargreaves, J. Davis, M. Fullan, R. Wignall, M. Stager, & R. Macmillan (Eds.), Secondary school work cultures and educational change (pp. 3-20). Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Hargreaves, D. H. (1980). The occupational culture of teachers. In P. Woods, Teacher strategies: Explorations in the sociology of the school, (pp. 125-148). London: Croom Helm, Limited.

Hoy, W.K., Tarter, C.J. & Kottkamp, R.B. (1991). Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Huberman, A. M. (1993). The model of the independent artisan in teachers' professional relations. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts (pp. 11-50). New York: Teachers College Press.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1984). Innovation up close: How school improvement works. New York: Plenum Press.

Iannaccone, L. (1991). Micropolitics of education: What and why. Education and Urban Society, 23, 465-471.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). The primacy and potential of high school departments. In M. W. McLaughlin, J. E. Talbert, & N. Bascia (Eds.), The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities (pp. 167-184). New York: Teachers College Press.

Kemis, M. & Sorenson, C. (1997, March). A school district's implementation of block scheduling and integrated curriculum: Studying organizational change. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Kruse, S. & Louis, K.S. (1995). Teacher teaming--Opportunities and dilemmas. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

LeCompte, M. D., & Dworkin, A. G. (1991). Giving up on school: Student dropouts and teacher burnouts. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Fernandez, A. (1994). Transformational leadership and teachers' commitment to change. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp. 77-98). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1978). The social realities of teaching. Teachers College Record, 80, 54-68.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-340.

Little, J. W. (1995a). Contested ground: The basis of teacher leadership in two restructuring schools. Elementary School Journal, 96(1), 47-63.

Little, J. W. (1995b). Subject affiliation in high schools that restructure. In L. S. Siskin and J. W. Little (Eds.), The subjects in question: Departmental organization and the high school (pp. 172-200). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Louis, K. S. (1992). Restructuring and the problem of teachers' work. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), The changing contexts of teaching: Ninety-first yearbook of the national society for the study of education (pp. 138-156). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Louis, K. S. (1994). Beyond 'managed change': Rethinking how schools improve. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5(1), 2-24.

Louis, K. S. (1995). Organizational structures to promote teacher engagement in urban schools. Urban education program. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Lab.

Louis, K. S., Kruse, S. & Raywid, M.A. (1996). Putting teachers at the center of reform: Learning schools and professional communities. NASSP Bulletin, 80(580), 9-21.

Louis, K. S., Marks, H., & Kruse, S. (1994, April). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Louis, K. S., Marks, H., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. American Educational Research Journal, 33(4), 757-798.

Louis, K. S., & Miles, M. B. (1990). Improving urban high school: What works and why. New York: Teachers College Press.

Louis, K. S., & Murphy, J. (1994). The evolving role of the principal: Some concluding thoughts. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp. 265-281). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Marshall, C. (1991). The chasm between administrator and teacher cultures: A micropolitical puzzle. In J. Blase (Ed.), The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation (pp. 139-160). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1990). The Rand change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. Educational Researcher, 19(9), 11-16.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1993). What matters most in teachers' workplace context? In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts (pp. 79-103). New York: Teachers College Press.

Metz, M. H. (1990). Real school: A universal drama amid disparate experience. In D. E. Mitchell & M. Goertz (Eds.), Educational politics for the new century (pp. 75-91). New York: Falmer Press.

Miller, L. (1990, April). A tale of two schools. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Boston, MA.

Mirel, J. (1994). School reform unplugged: The Bensenville new American school project, 1991-1993. American Educational Research Journal, 31, 481-518.

Muncey, D. E., & McQuillan, P. J. (1996). Reform and resistance in schools and classrooms: An ethnographic view of the Coalition of Essential Schools. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Murphy, J., Evertson, C. M. & Radnofsky, M. L. (1990, April). Restructuring schools, tracking classroom effects: Teachers' perceptions. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Boston, MA.

Newmann, F. M., Rutter, R. A., & Smith, M. S. (1989). Organizational factors that affect school sense of efficacy, community, and expectations. Sociology of Education, 62, 221-238.

Noblit, G., Berry, B., & Dempsey, V. (1991). Political responses to reform: A comparative study. Education and Urban Society, 23, 379-395.

Panaritis, P. (1995). Beyond brainstorming: Planning a successful interdisciplinary program. Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 623-628.

Peterson, C. H. (1966). Effective team teaching: The Easton Area High School program. West Nyack, NY: Parker Publishing Co.

Pink, W. T. (1994, April). Competing views of change: Reforming school culture. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Pink, W. T., & Borman, K. M. (1994). Community involvement and staff development in school improvement. In K. M. Borman & N. P. Greenman (Eds.), Changing American education: Recapturing the past or inventing the future? Albany: State University of New York Press.

Pray, H. E. (1969). Interdisciplinary team teaching. In G. F. Vars (Ed.), Common learnings: Core and interdisciplinary team approaches (pp. 83-94). Scranton, PA: International Textbook Company.

Prestine, N. A. (1994, April). A tentative analysis of essential school change efforts in Illinois. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Raudenbush, S. W., Rowan, B., & Cheong, Y. F. (1990). Contextual effects on the self-efficacy of high school teachers (Report No. P90-124). Stanford, CA: University of Stanford, Center for Research on the Context of Secondary Teaching.

Raywid, M. A. (1990). The evolving effort to improve schools: Pseudo-reform, incremental reform, and restructuring. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 139-143.

Raywid, M. A. (1997, March). Downsizing and restructuring: Lessons from three efforts. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Redefer, F. (1950). The eight year study . . . after eight years. Progressive Education, 28, 33.

Riseborough, R. (1981). Teacher careers and comprehensive schooling: An empirical study. Sociology, 15, 355-381.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman Publishing.

Sarason, S. B. (1971). The culture of school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The culture of school and the problem of change (rev. ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schwartz, R. B. (1971). Profile of a school: An introduction. Phi Delta Kappan, 52, 515.

Scott, F.B. (1994). Integrating curriculum implementation and staff development. Clearing House, 67(3), 157-160.

Siskin, L. S. (1990). Different worlds: The department as context for high school teachers (Report No. P90-126). Stanford, CA: University of Stanford, Center for Research on the Context of Secondary Teaching.

Siskin, L. S. (1991). School restructuring and subject subcultures (Report No. P91-135). Stanford, CA: University of Stanford, Center for Research on the Context of Secondary Teaching.

Siskin, L. S. (1994). Realms of knowledge: Academic departments in secondary schools. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis, Inc.

Siskin, L. S. (1995). Subject divisions. In L. S. Siskin and J. W. Little (Eds.), The subjects in question: Departmental organization and the high school (pp. 23-47). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Siskin, L. S. (1997, March). Restructuring knowledge: Mapping (inter)disciplinary change. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Spady, W. G. & Marshall, K. J. (1991). Beyond traditional outcome-based education. Educational Leadership, 49(2), 67-72.

Spies, P. (1994). Learning teams: The necessary design of secondary schools for the 21st century. Teaching and Change, 1(3), 219-237.

Spies, P. (1995, November). Turning the tables: The growing need for high schools to follow the lead of middle level reform thru interdisciplinary teaming. Paper presented at the Annual National Middle School Association Conference and Exhibit, New Orleans, LA.

Spies, P. (1996). High school learning teams: Engaging and empowering students and teachers through interpersonal and interdisciplinary connections. New Schools, New Communities, 12(2), 45-51.

Stager, M., & Fullan, M. G. (1992). Teacher purpose and educational change. In A. Hargreaves, J. Davis, M. Fullan, R. Wignall, M. Stager, & R. Macmillan (Eds.), Secondary school work cultures and educational change (pp. 195-212). Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Stapleford, T. A. (1994, April). The power of coalition: A comparative study of two school reform projects. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Stiegelbauer, S. (1992, April). Why we want to be teachers: New teachers talk about their reasons for entering the profession. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA.

Stodolsky, S.S. & Grossman, P.L. (1995). Subject-matter differences in secondary schools: Connections to higher education. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 64, 71-78.

Talbert, J. E. (1995). Boundaries of teachers' professional communities in U.S. high schools: Power and precariousness of the subject department. In L. S. Siskin and J. W. Little (Eds.), The subjects in question: Departmental organization and the high school (pp. 68-94). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Talbert, J. E., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1993). Understanding teaching in context. In D. K. Cohen, M. W. McLaughlin, & J. E. Talbert (Eds.), Teaching for understanding: Challenges for policy and practice (pp. 167-206). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Timar, T. B. (1990). The politics of school restructuring. In D. E. Mitchell & M. E. Goertz (Eds.), Education politics for the new century: The twentieth anniversary yearbook of the politics of education association (pp. 55-74). Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Tychy, N. M. (1983). Managing strategic change: Technical, political and cultural dynamics. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Tye, K. A. (1985). The junior high: School in search of a mission. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.

Vandenberghe, R, & Staessens, K. (1991, April). Vision as a core component of school culture. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Viadero, D. (1991, September 4). Alliance formed to push curriculum to front of reform agenda. Education Week, XI(1), 14.

Waller, W. (1932). The sociology of teaching. New York: Russell & Russell.

Wasley, P. A. (1994). Stirring the chalkdust: Tales of teachers changing classroom practice. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Weiss, C.H. (1995). The four "I's" of school reform: How interests, ideology, information, and institution affect teachers and principals. Harvard Educational Review, 65(4), 571-592.